

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP  
ROBERT A. VAN NEST - # 84065  
rvannest@kvn.com  
CHRISTA M. ANDERSON - # 184325  
canderson@kvn.com  
MICHAEL S. KWUN - # 198945  
mkwun@kvn.com  
633 Battery Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
Tel: 415.391.5400  
Fax: 415.397.7188

KING & SPALDING LLP  
DONALD F. ZIMMER, JR. - #112279  
fzimmer@kslaw.com  
CHERYL A. SABNIS - #224323  
csabnis@kslaw.com  
101 Second Street, Suite 2300  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Tel: 415.318.1200  
Fax: 415.318.1300

KING & SPALDING LLP  
SCOTT T. WEINGAERTNER  
(*Pro Hac Vice*)  
sweingaertner@kslaw.com  
ROBERT F. PERRY  
rperry@kslaw.com  
BRUCE W. BABER (Pro Hac Vice)  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
Tel: 212.556.2100  
Fax: 212.556.2222

IAN C. BALLON - #141819  
ballon@gtlaw.com  
HEATHER MEEKER - #172148  
meekerh@gtlaw.com  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
1900 University Avenue  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303  
Tel: 650.328.8500  
Fax: 650.328.8508

Attorneys for Defendant  
GOOGLE INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
GOOGLE INC.,  
  
Defendant.

Case No. 3:10-cv-03561 WHA

**GOOGLE INC.'S OPPOSITION TO  
ORACLE AMERICA'S MOTION FOR  
ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF TO DEEM  
FACTS ADMITTED BY GOOGLE**

Dept.: Courtroom 8, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Judge: Hon. William Alsup

## I. INTRODUCTION

The facts Oracle seeks to have deemed admitted for purposes of trial include a statement that inaccurately reflects Google’s concession regarding the originality of the APIs as a whole, a statement that the Court has already ruled is an issue of fact for trial, and three irrelevant and misleading statements taken from Google’s Amended Answer and Counterclaims. For the reasons set forth below, the Court should deny Oracle’s motion as to each of them.

## II. ARGUMENT

### A. Google does not deny that the APIs as a whole meet the extremely low threshold for originality required under the Constitution.

Oracle seeks to have the following statement deemed admitted: “Google has admitted that the 37 Java APIs meet the threshold for originality required by the Constitution.” But the cited March 23 Reply Copyright Trial Brief does not square with Oracle’s request:

The [API] packages *as a whole*, however, are not completely lacking in originality. Thus, while reserving the right to present evidence that many aspects of the APIs are unoriginal, Google does not dispute that the APIs *as a whole* meet the “extremely low” threshold for originality required by the Constitution. The jury therefore need not be asked to address whether the APIs are original.

Dkt. No. 823 at 9 (emphasis added); Motion at 1.

There are three important differences between Google’s concession and Oracle’s requested “admission.” First, Google conceded that the API packages “as a whole” are not completely lacking in originality for constitutional purposes. Google’s concession was never limited to the 37 APIs, as Oracle’s proposed statement is. Moreover, Google reserved its right to “present evidence that many aspects of the APIs are unoriginal,” which would include the right to argue that portions of the 37 APIs are unoriginal. Second, Google qualified its statement by noting that the threshold for originality required by the Constitution is “extremely low.” Oracle’s statement removes this important qualifier, thereby threatening to mislead the jury. Third, there is no reason—other than to lend undue weight—to begin the statement with the phrase “Google admits that.” As a procedural matter, this is not true. Google does not admit originality of the APIs as a whole; it has simply chosen not to dispute it. With respect to the other facts the Court deemed true, the Court adopted simple factual statements. (Dkt. No. 896.) The same should be

1 true here.

2 Notably, Google told Oracle that it was willing to stipulate to the following statement,  
3 which would have corrected for the various errors in Oracle's statement: "The Java APIs as a  
4 whole meet the low threshold for originality required by the Constitution." *See* Ex. 2 to the Decl.  
5 of Marc David Peters In Support of Oracle America's Motion for Administrative Relief to Deem  
6 Facts Admitted by Google [Dkt. No. 908-2]. Oracle declined. Instead, it asks the Court to bend  
7 Google's concession into an altogether different one. The Court should deny Oracle's request.

8 **B. The Court has already ruled that whether the Java programming language is**  
9 **distinct from the Java APIs is a dispute for trial.**

10 Oracle asks the Court to tell the jury that "Google has admitted that the Java programming  
11 language is distinct from the Java APIs and class libraries." But as Oracle concedes in its brief,  
12 the Court's April 11 Order (Dkt No. 896) identifies a live dispute between the parties on this very  
13 issue. Motion at 2.

14 One thing is for sure, the Java programming language is open and free for anyone to use.  
15 Dkt No. 896. Whether the APIs are therefore also free and open to use is an issue for trial,  
16 regardless whether they are "distinct from" the programming language as a technical matter. It is  
17 that technical point that Google makes in its counterclaims: the term "Java" may refer to many  
18 different things, including the language, the runtime environment, and the platform. Google  
19 Amended Counterclaims, Dkt. No. 51, at 13 ¶ 1. But however one carves "Java" into its  
20 architectural sub-parts, the jury must decide whether it is possible to use one part—the  
21 programming language—without the other parts—the APIs. As such, deeming it true that the  
22 Java APIs and class libraries are "distinct from" the programming language threatens to confuse  
23 the jury. For example, the jury may be misled into believing that one can technically use the  
24 programming language standing alone, without any of the APIs, which Google contests. Because  
25 the Court has already recognized the parties' disagreement in ruling on Google's deeming  
26 motion, the Court should deny Oracle's request.

**C. Oracle's third, fourth, and fifth facts take isolated statements from Google's Amended Counterclaims out of context, and would serve only to confuse the jury.**

Each of the third, fourth, and fifth facts that Oracle moves to deem admitted consist of isolated sentences plucked from the middle of paragraphs in Google's Amended Counterclaims [Dkt. No. 51]. Elevating these out-of-context statements to judicial admissions would serve only to confuse the jury concerning the disputed issues in this case.

Further, the very cases Oracle cites undermine its suggestion that every quasi-factual statement made in any pleading constitutes a judicial admission. In *American Title Ins. Co. v. Lacelaw Corp.*, 861 F.2d 224, 227 (9th Cir. 1998), which Oracle cites throughout its brief, the Ninth Circuit held that "statements of fact contained in a brief *may* be considered admissions of the party at the discretion of the district court," and then **affirmed** a district court's decision **not** to treat a party's pleading statement as a judicial admission. *Id.* at 227-28 (emphasis in original). Courts that have found admissions have focused on very specific facts, such as the date counsel was retained, *Leorna v. United States*, 105 F.3d 548, 551 n.2 (9th Cir. 1997), the address of a company's principal place of business, *Gradetech, Inc. v. Am. Emp'rs Grp.*, No. C 06-02991 WHA, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 47047, at \*9 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 29, 2006), or whether a plaintiff class was limited to those arrested for misdemeanors as opposed to felonies, *Barnett v. County of Contra Costa*, No. C-04-4437-THE, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8131, at \*9-10 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 24, 2007). On the other hand, "conduct requiring elaboration does not constitute a judicial admission—to become an admission, the conduct must be 'deliberate, clear, and unequivocal.'" *Truckstop.Net, L.L.C. v. Sprint Communications Co., L.P.*, 537 F. Supp. 2d 1126, 1136 (D. Id. 2008) (quoting *Heritage bank v. Redcom Laboratories, Inc.*, 250 F.3d 319, 329 (5th Cir. 2001)).

Google's purported "admissions" here do not meet this test. The third and fourth "facts" that Oracle moves to deem admitted are selections from a longer paragraph in Google's Amended Counterclaim criticizing the way in which Sun open-sourced Java. Google wrote:

Upon information and belief, Sun also released the specifications for Sun's Java platform, including Sun's Java virtual machine, under a free-of-charge license that can be found at [http://java.sun.com/docs/books/jls/third\\_edition/html/jcopyright.html](http://java.sun.com/docs/books/jls/third_edition/html/jcopyright.html) and [http://java.sun.com/docs/books/jvms/second\\_edition/html/Copyright.doc.html](http://java.sun.com/docs/books/jvms/second_edition/html/Copyright.doc.html),

1 respectively. The license allows developers to create “clean room”  
 2 implementations of Sun’s Java specifications. If those implementations  
 3 demonstrate compatibility with the Java specification, then Sun would provide a  
 4 license for any of its intellectual property needed to practice the specification,  
 5 including patent rights and copyrights. One example of a “clean room”  
 6 implementation of Sun’s Java is Apache Harmony, developed by the Apache  
 7 Software Foundation. The only way to demonstrate compatibility with the Java  
 8 specification is by meeting all of the requirements of Sun’s Technology  
 9 Compatibility Kit (“TCK”) for a particular edition of Sun’s Java. Importantly,  
 10 however, TCKs were only available from Sun, initially were not available as open  
 11 source, were provided solely at Sun’s discretion, and included several restrictions,  
 12 such as additional licensing terms and fees. In essence, although developers were  
 13 free to develop a competing Java virtual machine, they could not openly obtain an  
 14 important component needed to freely benefit from Sun’s purported open-sourcing  
 15 of Java.

16 Google’s Amended Counterclaims, Dkt. No. 51, at 15 ¶ 6.

17 Oracle pulls two statements from their context in the middle of this paragraph and asks the  
 18 Court to treat them as standalone admissions. First, it moves to deem admitted that “the only way  
 19 to demonstrate compatibility with the Java specification is by meeting all of the requirements of  
 20 Sun’s Technology Compatibility Kit (‘TCK’) for a particular edition of Sun’s Java.” Motion at 3.  
 21 In the above paragraph, this sentence merely describes one of Sun’s license requirements: that  
 22 Java implementations using Sun’s intellectual property had to satisfy Sun’s definition of  
 23 compatibility. In other words, the sentence simply describes Sun’s tautological approach to  
 24 defining “compatibility with the Java specification.” For Sun, that phrase meant anything that  
 25 satisfied the TCK. What actual, substantive “compatibility” might mean could be very different.  
 26 Oracle is trying to treat Google’s *criticism* of Sun’s tautological definition of “compatibility” as  
 27 an *admission* of the correctness of that definition. That is baseless.

28 Second, Oracle moves to deem admitted that:

TCKs were only available from Sun, initially not available as open source, were  
 provided solely at Sun’s discretion, and included several restrictions, such as  
 additional licensing terms and fees. In essence, although developers were free to  
 develop a competing Java virtual machine, they could not openly obtain an  
 important component needed to freely benefit from Sun’s purported open-sourcing  
 of Java.

Motion at 4. As above, this sentence is confusing and misleading when viewed in isolation. It  
 includes numerous phrases, such as “competing Java virtual machine,” “important component,”  
 “freely benefit,” and “purported open-sourcing of Java” that make sense only when read together

1 with earlier parts of the paragraph. Moreover, the context of this paragraph is another criticism of  
 2 Sun—the fact that Sun’s purported decision to open source the *entire Java platform*, including its  
 3 source code implementations of the virtual machine, was deceptive because Sun required  
 4 developers using those open-source implementations to pass the TCK, for which Sun charged a  
 5 fee. Divorced from that context, the statement can be misinterpreted in numerous ways, including  
 6 suggesting that a TCK was required in order to use the Java APIs. Again, this is inconsistent with  
 7 the Court’s recognition of a live dispute as to whether the Java APIs are part of the programming  
 8 language.

9       The fifth point that Oracle moves to deem admitted is an isolated statement from another  
 10 paragraph in Google’s Counterclaim. Specifically, Oracle moves to deem admitted that  
 11 “Although Sun offered to open source the TCK for Java SE, Sun included field of use (‘FOU’)  
 12 restrictions that limited the circumstances under which Apache Harmony users could use the  
 13 software that the Apache Software Foundation created. Sun refused the ASF’s request for a TCK  
 14 license without FOU restrictions.” Motion at 4. This sentence comes from the middle of a  
 15 section in Google’s Counterclaims that describes how Oracle first encouraged Sun to grant  
 16 Apache a TCK license for Harmony, and then opposed granting Apache such a license after  
 17 acquiring Sun. Google’s Amended Counterclaims, Dkt. No. 51, at 15-17 ¶¶ 7-9. As Google has  
 18 argued elsewhere, *see, e.g.*, Dkt. No. 831, Apache’s goal in obtaining a TCK license was to call  
 19 itself “Java.” Once Sun sought to impose FOU restrictions on its TCK license, Apache refused to  
 20 take the license and continued to distribute Harmony, including its independent implementations  
 21 of the Java APIs. Sun never suggested that Apache, without obtaining such a license, could not  
 22 distribute Harmony, including for use in mobile devices. Indeed, Jonathan Schwartz, Sun’s CEO,  
 23 specifically endorsed Apache’s distribution of Harmony. TX 2341 (“[T]here is no reason that  
 24 Apache cannot ship Harmony today.”). Moreover, Oracle’s statement is false. Sun never finally  
 25 refused Apache’s request; it was **Oracle** who did that after buying Sun. Again, Oracle is trying to  
 26 confuse the jury into thinking that Sun required that Apache have a license to distribute Harmony  
 27 for use in mobile devices, when in fact the evidence will show that Sun objected only to Apache  
 28 calling Harmony “Java.” Google never admitted the contrary.

1 Dated: April 13, 2012

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

2 /s/ Robert A. Van Nest  
By: ROBERT A. VAN NEST

3 Attorneys for Defendant  
4 GOOGLE INC.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28